UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/621,620	07/17/2003	Graham M. Clarke	57901US005	1875	
32692 7590 05/14/2009 3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			EXAMINER		
			WITCZAK, CATHERINE		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3767		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/14/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com LegalDocketing@mmm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Occurrence	10/621,620	CLARKE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	CATHERINE N. WITCZAK	3767					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ap	oril 2009.						
·= · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.						
<i>,</i> —	· 						
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.							
,— , , , — , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	t.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>17 July 2003</u> is/are: a)[y the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	_ · · · · · · · ·	•					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No.					
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	•						
Attachment(s)							
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application					
apor rolo/main bate	o/						

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued

examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the

finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

submission filed on 4/29/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode

contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that

the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The

specification as originally filed does not include support for a solid (not hollow) microneedle tip.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of

the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the solid (ie not hollow) tip must be shown or the

feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sherman et al (US 2002/0020688).

Sherman et al disclose in Figure 11 a microneedle device comprising a first major surface (140), a plurality of microneedles (182, 184) formed of polymers (paragraphs 0015 and 0016) comprising a base

Art Unit: 3767

that is tapered to a flat truncated tip distal the base. Sherman et al disclose in paragraph 0088 that the microneedle can comprise a solid flat tip. Sherman et al further disclose in paragraphs 0075 and 0076 the flat tip capable of comprising an area of between 20 and 100 square micrometers and the base are capable of being 900 square micrometers or more, and the height base ratio being capable of being 3:1 or more. Sherman et al also disclose in these paragraphs a microneedle device capable of having a cross-sectional area of no more than 25% of the base on a plane located at a distance of 0.98h from the base.

Sherman et al disclose in paragraph 0009 the method of using the microneedle device comprising the step of contacting the skin and forcing the microneedle device against the skin.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/29/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to the 112th rejection, Applicant argues that the specification describes the microneedle as being a frustum of a pyramid and goes on to provide the definition of frustum: "part of a solid, such as a cone or pyramid, between two parallel planes cutting the solid, especially the section between the base and a plane parallel to the base. However, Examiner points Applicant to the definition of 'solid' when taken in a mathematical context as provided by Encarta, wherein the term solid is defined as "three-dimensional: having the three dimensions of length, breadth, and depth, or relating to geometric figures that have three dimensions." Thus, the term 'solid' in the definition of frustum does not necessarily imply that the cone/pyramid/etc actually be solid in the everyday sense of the word (ie not hollow) – but in the definition of frustum the solid is actually meant as a three-dimensional object. Thus, although the Applicant's specification discloses the microneedle as being a frustum, this simply provides support for the fact that the microneedle is a three-dimensional structure.

As to Applicant's arguments regarding the drawings, it is the Examiner's position that it is unclear in the drawings and specification that the top surface 32 is solid. From the drawings it appears that 32 is the top surface of a bore which extends through the microneedle.

As to Applicant's arguments regarding the Sherman reference, Examiner once again argues that Sherman does disclose a flat tip. Although the needle comes to a point at the tip, all the points which lie around the circumference which make up the microneedle lie on the same plane and thus make the tip 'flat,'

Conclusion

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CATHERINE N. WITCZAK whose telephone number is (571)272-7179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8-5 EST.

Application/Control Number: 10/621,620

Art Unit: 3767

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin

Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Page 6

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Catherine N Witczak/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767

/Kevin C. Sirmons/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767